REMARKS

The Applicant does not believe that entry of the foregoing amendment will result in the introduction of new matter into the present application for invention. Therefore, the Applicant, respectfully, requests that the above amendment be entered in and that the claims to the present application, kindly, be reconsidered.

The Office Action dated May 25, 2004 has been received and considered by the Applicant. Claims 1-23 are pending in the present application for invention. Claims 20-23 have been rejected by the May 25, 2004 Office Action. Claims 1-19 are allowed by the May 25, 2004 Office Action.

The Office Action rejects Claims 20-23 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,528,284 issued to Iwami et al. (hereinafter referred to as Iwami et al.). The Examiner making the rejection with regard to Claim 20 states that, Iwami et al. disclose a video recovery system for use when transmitting frames of encoded video from a first device to a second device, the system comprising: a system for determining if a degraded signal condition exists between the first device and the second device, a system that transmits an intra-coded video frame in place of video frame having predictive elements if the degraded signal condition exists. The, Applicant, respectfully, submits that independent Claim 20 has been amended to recite "a signal analysis system at the first device for receiving a return signal from the second device" to clearly distinguish the subject matter defined by Claim 20 from the teaching of Iwami et al. The Applicant respectfully submits that Iwami et al. do not disclose, or suggest, "a signal analysis system at the first device for receiving a return signal from the second device" as recited by amended Claim 20. Therefore, Claim 20 as amended is believed to be allowable over the cited reference, Iwami et al.

Claims 21-23 depend from Claim 20, either directly or indirectly, and further narrow and define Claim 20. Therefore, Claims 21-23 are also believed to be allowable.

Claims 1-19 have been allowed by the May 25, 2004 Office Action.

In an effort to move the present application for invention towards allowance, the Applicants have amended the claims to the invention.

Applicant is not aware of any additional patents, publications, or other information not previously submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office which would be required under 37 C.F.R. 1.99.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, with such allowance being, respectfully, requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

James D. Leimbach, Reg. 34,374
Patent Attorney (585) 381-9983

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION
I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being transmitted on this date via
facsimile transmission to (703) 872-9306 AND addressed to:
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date of Transmission: August 25, 2004

_____
(Signature)